REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Objections.

Claims 13 and 26 have been amended as indicated to correct the informalities.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103.

Claims 1 through 8, 10 through 13, 15 through 21, 23-24, and 26 have been rejected over Vasko in view of Rosenquist.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 16 to provide additional limitations defining safety and standard programs, acknowledging, however, that these programs are of the same type as described in the Vasko application currently cited. Further Applicant agrees that Rosenquist generally teaches a hardware system for blocking right access to memory of a type that might be used in the present invention.

Nevertheless, neither of the cited references of Vasko and Rosenquist, alone or in combination, teach applying a memory lock to a program depending on whether that program is executing, much less applying the memory lock to a portion of memory holding a safety program when the safety program is not executing and removing the lock from the portion of memory holding a safety program when the safety program is executing, as specifically claimed in claims 1 and 16.

Vasko is silent as to locking memory, and in Rosenquist the application of the memory locking is to prevent transfer of applications into and out of the machine on which they are executing, not to limit the operation of the applications when they are executing on the machine. See generally, [0032] of Rosenquist. Rosenquist in contrast to the present invention, states that memory locking is to be controlled according to whether the correct serial numbers are obtained for the purchased application. Neither Rosenquist nor Vasko teach or suggest the benefits of memory locking for safety applications where there is a danger of program corruption by a standard program running on the same machine that might degrade the reliability required of safety procedures.

Applicant further believes there is no teaching or suggestion for the combination of these two particular applications other than a hindsight recognition that various components of the present invention are obtained in these different references.

Claims 6 and 19 require that the processing unit confirm that the program is locked prior to unlocking, something that is neither taught nor suggested by either of these references. Applicant cannot find support for checking prior to unlocking of the program and generating an error anywhere in the Rosenquist application or at paragraphs [0007] and [0023].

Claims 7 and 20 have been amended to indicate that the register indicating the status of the memory portion is locked and unlocked is readable. While Rosenquist arguably provides a register somewhere that indicates a status of the memory portions, there is no indication that it is readable or any need for it to be readable in Rosenquist.

Claim 26 requires both control of memory blocking based on the state of a program as executing or not, and the division of tasks according to reliability requirements. This former limitation is not believed to be fairly taught by the references of Vasko and Rosenquist for the same reasons as discussed above. It is also believed that neither Rosenquist nor Vasko teach a segregation of tasks according to required reliability for loading into protected and unprotected memory.

In light of these comments and amendments, it is believed that claims 1-26 are now in condition for allowance, and allowance is respectfully requested.

Although no additional fees are believed due for filing this amendment, if an additional fee is deemed to be due, please charge any fee to Deposit Account No. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES MARTIN RISCHAR

By: _____

Keith M. Baxter, Reg. No. 31,233
Attorney for Applicant
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 E. Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53202-4497
(414) 277-5719